



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,025	07/12/2001	Roberto DeLima	RSW920010098US1	1942

7590 02/09/2005

Jeanine S. Ray-Yarletts
IBM Corporation
T81/503
PO Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

JEAN GILLES, JUDE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/904,025

Applicant(s)

DELIMA ET AL.

Examiner

Jude J Jean-Gilles

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 2143

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is responsive to communication filed on 07/12/2001.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 1, 5, 7, 13, 15, 19, 21, 27, 31, and 33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickell (Brickell), U.S. Patent No. 6,834,112 in view of Dietz et al. (Dietz), U.S. Patent No. 6,665,725 B1.

Regarding **claims 1 and 15**, Brickell teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Brickell discloses a method and means in a data processing system for processing a request, the method and means comprising:

receiving the request (*column 3, lines 38-46*);

responsive to a first hash value being present within the request, comparing the first hash value to a second hash value, wherein the second hash value represents a current policy configuration(*column 2, lines 57-64; column 4, lines 24-48*); and

a match between the first hash value and the second hash value.

However, Brickell fails to teach , responsive to the match setting a quality of service based on information or policy configuration associated with the first hash value.

In the same field of endeavor, Dietz discloses a (compiling statistics from a hash algorithm that provides analysis for measuring the quality of service based on many configurations...) [see Dietz, *column 17, lines 29-61*].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Dietz's teachings of a method and apparatus to use hash value to set the quality of service, with the teachings of Brickell, for the purpose of "*allowing high packet rates to be successfully monitored in a network*" as stated by Dietz in lines 30-32 of column 13. Thus, Brickell also provides motivation to combine by stating a need to also provide to the network with "*the ability to more effectively distribute private keys in an insecure network to various terminals...*" [see Brickell, *column 2, lines 28-30*]. By this rationale **claims 1 and 15** are rejected.

Regarding **claim 5**, the combination Brickell -Dietz teaches the method of claim 1 further comprising:

responsive to an absence of a hash value in the request, identifying a policy rule for processing the request to form an identified policy rule;

identifying a classification for the request using the identified policy rule; hashing the current policy configuration, of which the identified policy rule is a part, using a hashing algorithm to generate a current hash value [see *Brickell, column 5, lines 66-67; column 6, lines 1-20*]; and

placing the current hash value and the information into the request. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 5 [see *Brickell, column 5, lines 49-67*]. By this rationale **claim 5** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 7**, the combination Brickell -Dietz teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the data processing system is a server [see *Brickell, fig. 1, items 101-102; column 3, lines 7-20*]. . The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 7 [see *Brickell, fig. 1, items 101-102; column 3, lines 7-20*]. By this rationale **claim 7** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 13**, the combination Brickell -Dietz teaches a data processing system comprising:

a bus system [see *Dietz, fig. 10, items 1003-1004; column 18, lines 41-53*];

a communications unit connected to the bus system [see *Dietz, fig. 10, items 1122; column 20, lines 6-21*];

a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions [see *Dietz, fig. 10, items 1008, 1010; column 19, lines 36-61*]; and

a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to receive the request [see *Dietz, fig. 11, items 1108; column 20, lines 15-31*]; compare the first hash value to a second hash value in response to a first hash value being present within the request, wherein the second hash value represents a current policy configuration for a quality of service [see *Dietz, column 17, lines 29-61*]; and set a quality of service based on information associated with the first hash value in response to a match between the first hash value and the second hash value [see *Brickell, column 2, lines 57-64; column 4, lines 24-67; column 5, lines 1-8*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1,

Art Unit: 2143

applies equally as well to claim 13 [see *Dietz, column 13, lines 30-32*]. By this rationale **claim 13** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 19**, the combination Brickell -Dietz teaches the data processing system of claim 15 further comprising:

first identifying means, responsive to an absence of a hash value in the request, for identifying a policy rule for processing the request to form an identified policy rule [see *Brickell, column 5, lines 19-65; column 6, lines 1-20*];

second identifying means for identifying a classification for the request using the identified policy rule [see *Brickell, column 5, lines 19-65; column 6, lines 1-20*];

hashing means for hashing the current policy configuration, of which the identified policy rule is a part, using a hashing algorithm to generate a current hash value [see *Brickell, column 4, lines 18-67*]; and

placing means for placing the current hash value and the information into the request [see *Brickell, column 4, lines 18-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 19 [see *Dietz, column 13, lines 30-32*]. By this rationale **claim 19** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 21**, the combination Brickell -Dietz teaches the data processing system of claim 15, wherein the data processing system is a server [see *Brickell, fig. 1, items 101-102; column 3, lines 7-20*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 21 [see *Dietz, column 13, lines 30-32*]. By this rationale **claim 21** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 27**, the combination Brickell -Dietz teaches a computer program product in a computer readable medium for processing a request, the computer program product comprising:

first instructions for receiving the request [see *Brickell*, column 2, lines 65-67; column 3, lines 1-37] ;

second instructions, responsive to a first hash value being present within the request, for comparing the first hash value to a second hash value[see *Brickell*, column 3, lines 37-67; column 4, lines 1-67], wherein the second hash value represents a current policy configuration for a quality of service [see *Dietz*, column 17, lines 29-61]; and

third instructions, responsive to a match between the first hash value and the second hash value [see *Brickell*, column 3, lines 37-67; column 4, lines 1-67], for setting a quality of service based on information associated with the first hash value [see *Dietz*, column 17, lines 29-61]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 27 [see *Dietz*, column 13, lines 30-32]. By this rationale **claim 27** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 31**, the combination Brickell -Dietz teaches the computer program product of claim 27 further comprising:

fourth instructions, responsive to an absence of a hash value in the request, for identifying a policy rule for processing the request to form an identified policy rule [see *Brickell*, column 5, lines 19-65; column 6, lines 1-20];

fifth instructions for identifying a classification for the request using the identified policy rule [see *Brickell*, column 5, lines 19-65; column 6, lines 1-20];

sixth instructions for hashing the current policy configuration, of which the identified policy rule is a part, using a hashing algorithm to generate a current hash value [see *Brickell*, column 4, lines 18-67]; and

seventh instructions for placing the current hash value and the information into the request [see *Brickell*, column 4, lines 18-67]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 31 [see *Dietz*, column 13, lines 30-32]. By this rationale **claim 31** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 33**, the combination Brickell -Dietz teaches the computer program product of claim 27, wherein the data processing system is a server [see *Brickell*, fig. 1, items 101-102; column 3, lines 7-20]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 1, applies equally as well to claim 33 [see *Dietz*, column 13, lines 30-32]. By this rationale **claim 33** is rejected.

3. **Claims 6, 8-11, 22-25, 34-35, and 37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickell in view of Farber et al. (Farber), U.S. Patent No. 6,185,598 B1.

Regarding **claim 6**, Brickell teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Brickell discloses the method of claim 5, but fail to disclose a method wherein the hash value and the information are placed into a cookie.

Art Unit: 2143

In the same field of endeavor, Farber discloses (..a request for a resource within a hash value that is attached to a co called "cookie"...) [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 20-62].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Farber's teachings of a method and apparatus to use a request attached in a cookie, with the teachings of Brickell, for the purpose of "*allowing the server to record to request and determine whether the cached resource may be served or not...*" as stated by Farber in lines 40-43 of column 23. Thus, Brickell also provides motivation to combine by stating a need to also provide to the network with "*the ability to more effectively distribute private keys in an insecure network to various terminals...*" [see Brickell, column 2, lines 28-30]. By this rationale **claim 6 is** rejected.

Regarding **claim 8**, the combination Brickell -Farber teaches a method in a data processing system for processing a request, the method comprising:

responsive to receiving a request containing a selected cookie in which the selected cookie [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 20-62] includes a first hash value and information associated with the hash value, determining whether the first hash value corresponds to a second hash value, wherein the second hash value represents a current policy configuration for processing requests by the data processing system [see *Brickell*, column 4, lines 24-67; column 5, lines 1-42]; and

responsive to a correspondence between the first hash value and the second hash value, processing the request using the information [see *Brickell*, column 2, lines

57-64; *column 4, lines 24-67*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 6, applies equally as well to claim 8 [see *Farber, column 23, lines 40-43*]. By this rationale **claim 8** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 9**, the combination Brickell -Farber teaches the method of claim 8 further comprising:

responsive to receiving a request containing the selected cookie, determining whether the selected cookie is stale; responsive to an absence of a determination that the cookie being is stale, generating a new classification for the request; and responsive to the cookie being stale, preventing initiation of the determining step [see *Farber, column 23, lines 22-65*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 6, applies equally as well to claim 9 [see *Farber, column 23, lines 40-43*]. By this rationale **claim 9** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 10**, the combination Brickell -Farber teaches the method of claim 9 further comprising: responsive to an absence of the selected cookie, processing the request with the current policy configuration to generate a first classification for the request [see *Farber, column 23, lines 22-65*];

applying a hashing algorithm to the current policy configuration to generate the first hash value[see *Brickell, column 4, lines 18-67*]; and

placing the first hash value and information associated with the first hash value within a new cookie [see *Farber, column 23, lines 22-65*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 6, applies equally as well to claim 10 [see *Farber, column 23, lines 40-43*]. By this rationale **claim 10** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 11**, the combination Brickell -Farber teaches the method of claim 8, wherein the selected cookie includes a universal resource identifier, a user identification, and a user group identification [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65; column 8, lines 1-67]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 6, applies equally as well to claim 11 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 11** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 22**, the combination Brickell -Farber teaches a data processing system for processing a request, the data processing system comprising:

determining means, responsive to receiving a request containing a selected cookie in which the selected cookie includes a first hash value and information associated with the hash value, for determining whether the first hash value corresponds to a second hash value, wherein the second hash value represents a current policy configuration for processing requests by the data processing system [see *Brickell*, column 4, lines 24-67; column 5, lines 1-42]; and

processing means, responsive to a correspondence between the first hash value and the second hash value, for processing the request using the information [see *Brickell*, column 2, lines 57-64; column 4, lines 24-67]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 6, applies equally as well to claim 22 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 22** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 23**, the combination Brickell -Farber teaches the method of claim 22, wherein the determining means is a first determining means and further comprising: second determining means, responsive to receiving a request containing

Art Unit: 2143

the selected cookie, for determining whether the selected cookie is stale; generating means, responsive to an absence of a determination that the cookie being is stale, for generating a new classification for the request; and preventing means, responsive to the cookie being stale, for preventing initiation of the determining means [see *Farber, column 23, lines 22-65*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 6, applies equally as well to claim 23 [see *Farber, column 23, lines 40-43*]. By this rationale **claim 23** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 24**, the combination Brickell -Farber teaches the data processing system of claim 23, wherein the processing means is a first processing means and further comprising:

second processing means, responsive to an absence of the selected cookie, for processing the request with the current policy configuration to generate a first classification for the request [see *Farber, column 23, lines 22-65*];

applying means for applying a hashing algorithm to the current policy configuration to generate the first hash value [see *Brickell, column 4, lines 18-67*]; and

placing means for placing the first hash value and information associated with the first hash value within a new cookie [see *Farber, column 23, lines 22-65*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 6, applies equally as well to claim 24 [see *Farber, column 23, lines 40-43*]. By this rationale **claim 24** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 25**, the combination Brickell -Farber teaches the data processing system of claim 22, wherein the selected cookie includes a universal resource identifier, a user identification, and a group identification [see *Farber, column*

23, lines 22-65; column 8, lines 1-67]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 6, applies equally as well to claim 25 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 25** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 34**, the combination Brickell -Farber teaches a computer program product in a computer readable medium for processing a request, the computer program product comprising:

first instructions, responsive to receiving a request containing a selected cookie [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 20-62] in which the selected cookie includes a first hash value and information associated with the hash value, for determining whether the first hash value corresponds to a second hash value, wherein the second hash value represents a current policy configuration for processing requests by the data processing system [see *Brickell*, column 4, lines 24-67; column 5, lines 1-42]; and

second instructions, responsive to a correspondence between the first hash value and the second hash value, for processing the request using the information [see *Brickell*, column 2, lines 57-64; column 4, lines 24-67]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 6, applies equally as well to claim 34 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 34** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 35**, the combination Brickell -Farber teaches the computer program product of claim 34 further comprising: third instructions, responsive to receiving a request containing the selected cookie, for determining whether the selected cookie is stale; fourth instructions, responsive to an absence by a determination that the cookie being is stale, for generating a new classification for the request; and fifth

Art Unit: 2143

instructions, responsive to the cookie being stale, for preventing initiation of the determining step [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 6, applies equally as well to claim 35 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 35** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 37**, the combination Brickell -Farber teaches the computer program product of claim 34, wherein the selected cookie includes a universal resource identifier, a user identification, and a group identification [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65; column 8, lines 1-67]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 6, applies equally as well to claim 37 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 37** is rejected.

4. **Claims 2-4, 12, 14, 16—18, 20, 26, 28-30, 32, 36, and 38** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brickell and Dietz as applied to claims 1, 15, 27 above, and in further view of Farber.

Regarding **claim 2**, the combination Brickell-Dietz teaches the invention substantially as claimed. Brickell-Dietz discloses the method of claim 1, but fails to disclose the first hash value and the information located in a cookie within the request.

In the same field of endeavor, Farber discloses (..a request for a resource within a hash value that is attached to a co called "cookie"...) [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 20-62].

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the networking art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated Farber's teachings of a

method and apparatus to use a request attached in a cookie, with the teachings of Brickell-Dietz, for the purpose of “*allowing the server to record to request and determine whether the cached resource may be served or not...*” as stated by Farber in lines 40-43 of column 23. Thus, Brickell also provides motivation to combine by stating a need to also provide to the network with “*the ability to more effectively distribute private keys in an insecure network to various terminals...*” [see Brickell, column 2, lines 28-30]. By this rationale **claim 2** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 3**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the method of claim 2, wherein the cookie is located within a header of the request [see Farber, column 23, lines 20-62]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 3 [see Farber, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 3** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 4**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the request is a hypertext transport protocol request [see Farber, column 23, lines 20-62]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 4 [see Farber, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 4** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 12**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the method of claim 8, wherein the information includes a quality of service indicator [see Dietz, column 17, lines 29-69]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 12 [see Farber, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 12** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 14**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches a data processing system comprising:

a bus system [see *Dietz, fig. 10, items 1003-1004; column 18, lines 41-53*];

a communications unit connected to the bus system [see *Dietz, fig. 10, items 1122; column 20, lines 6-21*];

a memory connected to the bus system, wherein the memory includes a set of instructions [see *Dietz, fig. 10, items 1008, 1010; column 19, lines 36-61*]; and

a processing unit connected to the bus system, wherein the processing unit executes the set of instructions to determine whether the first hash value corresponds to a second hash value in response to receiving a request containing a selected cookie in which the selected cookie [see *Farber, column 23, lines 22-65*] includes a first hash value and information associated with the hash value, wherein the second hash value represents a current policy configuration for processing requests by the data processing system; and process the request using the information in response to a correspondence between the first hash value and the second hash value [see *Brickell, column 2, lines 57-64, column 4, lines 24-67, column 5, lines 1-8*]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 14 [see *Farber, column 23, lines 40-43*]. By this rationale **claim 14** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 16**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the data processing system of claim 15, wherein the first hash value and the information are located in a cookie within the request [see *Farber, column 23, lines 22-65*]. The same

motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 16 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 16** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 17**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the data processing system of claim 16, wherein the cookie is located within a header of the request [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 17 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 17** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 18**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the data processing system of claim 15, wherein the request is a hypertext transport protocol request [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 18 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 18** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 20**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the data processing system of claim 19, wherein the hash value and the information are placed into a cookie [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 20 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 20** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 26**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the data processing system of claim 22, wherein the information includes a quality of service indicator [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 26 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 26** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 28**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the computer program product of claim 27, wherein the first hash value and the information are located in a cookie within the request [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 28 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 28** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 29**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the computer program product of claim 28, wherein the cookie is located within a header of the request [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 29 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 29** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 30**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the computer program product of claim 27, wherein the request is a hypertext transport protocol request [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 30 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 30** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 32**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the computer program product of claim 31, wherein the hash value and the information are placed into a cookie [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 32 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 32** is rejected.

Regarding **claim 36**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the computer program product of claim 35 further comprising:

sixth instructions, responsive to an absence of the selected cookie [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65], for processing the request with the current policy configuration to generate a first classification for the request [see *Brickell*, column 5, lines 19-65; column 6, lines 1-20];

seventh instructions for applying a hashing algorithm to the current policy configuration to generate the first hash value [see *Brickell*, column 4, lines 18-67]; and

eighth instructions for placing the first hash value and information associated with the first hash value within a new cookie [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 36 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 36** is rejected

Regarding **claim 38**, the combination Brickell-Dietz-Farber teaches the computer program product of claim 34, wherein the information includes a quality of service indicator [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 22-65]. The same motivation that was utilized in the combination of claim 2, applies equally as well to claim 38 [see *Farber*, column 23, lines 40-43]. By this rationale **claim 38** is rejected.

Art Unit: 2143

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from examiner should be directed to Jude Jean-Gilles whose telephone number is (571) 272-3914. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley, can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3719.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Jude Jean-Gilles

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2143

JJG

January 29, 2005

Will C. Va
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2143
William C. Vaughn, Jr.

